

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending. No claim has been amended, canceled, or added.

The Examiner asserted that claims 1-25 are directed to multiple, patentably, distinct species: Species 1 relating to Fig. 2; Species 2 relating to Figs. 3, 4, and 6; Species 3 relating to Fig. 5; and Species 5 relating to Figs. 7 and 8. Applicant provisionally elects Species 2 relating to Figs. 3, 4, and 6. Applicants also traverse the restriction requirement.

The Examiner stated that currently there is no generic claim for the "alleged" four species. Applicants disagree. Applicants believe the independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 21, and 25) are generic enough to cover the embodiments relating to Figs. 2-8. For example, claim 1 recites, "A power device, comprising: a semiconductor substrate of first conductivity having an upper surface and a lower surface; an isolation diffusion region of second conductivity provided at a periphery of the substrate and extending from the upper surface to the lower surface of the substrate, the isolation diffusion region having a first surface corresponding to the upper surface of the substrate and a second surface corresponding to the lower surface; a peripheral junction region of second conductivity formed at least partly within the isolation diffusion region and formed proximate the first surface of the isolation diffusion region; and first and second terminals." The devices illustrated in the figures are all power devices, e.g., diodes, IGBTs, and Thyristors. The diodes, IGBT, Thyristors, and the like of the claimed invention all have a substrate, an isolation diffusion region, a peripheral junction region, and first and second terminals.

If the Examiner still believes that no generic claim is presented in the present application, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to provide specific explanation as to why the independent claims would not be considered to be generic claims.

In addition, MPEP 806.04(e) states that "...a claim may include two or more disclosed embodiments within the breadth and scope of definition." MPEP 803 states that. "If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions."

Appl. No. 10/650,451
Amdt. dated May 27, 2004
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2004

PATENT

In the present application, there are only three independent claims and twenty-two dependent claims, i.e., twenty-five total. Applicants note that the basic filing fee covers up to 20 claims with 3 independent claims. That is, the present application only has 5 more dependent claims than that allowed by the basic filling fee. Accordingly, Applicants do not believe examination of the pending claims, i.e., claim 1-25, in the present state would impose "serious burden" on the Examiner. The present restriction requirement, therefore, is inappropriate and should be withdrawn.

However, in the spirit of cooperation, Applicants would be willing to cancel five dependent claims (i.e., claims 6, 7, 8, 17, and 18) to reduce the examination burden on the Examiner if the Examiner agrees to withdraw the restriction requirement.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,



Steve Y. Cho
Reg. No. 44,612

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
SYC:asb
60214603 v1